



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,113	02/03/2006	Valery Khazhmuratovich Zhikov	4874-7001	2931
85775 7590 09/08/2009 Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP Attn: IP Docketing Three World Financial Center New York, NY 10281-2101				
EXAMINER				
LEWIS, PATRICK T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1623				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/08/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptopatentcommunication@lockelord.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/567,113

Applicant(s)

ZHILOV ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick T. Lewis

Art Unit

1623

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Patrick T. Lewis.

(3) _____.

(2) Matthew Eggerding.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 28.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yurugi et al. and Zhilov et al. (both of record).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Eggerding asked for guidance in regards to overcoming the rejection of record. The examiner explained that Yurugi taught similar compounds that functions as cardio-vasodialators (used to treat ED). The examiner suggested comparing applicant's compounds with the compounds of the prior art in order to show unexpected results or providing prior art showing unpredictability within the genus in regards to this property.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Patrick T. Lewis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623